


The Office has characterized the inventions of Group I and II as related as process of making and product made. Citing M.P.E.P. §806.05(f), the Office concludes that the process as claimed can be "used to make a reflecting film." However, there is no evidence of record to show that the claimed process could "make a reflecting film" as alleged by the Office, or that the proposed "reflecting film" would be materially different from the claimed laminated window. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the requirement for restriction is improper, and request that it be withdrawn.

Accordingly, and for the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain a requirement for restriction. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the requirement for restriction be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record

Registration No. 24,618

Thomas A. Blinka, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,541



22850

(703) 413-3000
NFO/TABLI/smi